UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

The New Mind for the New Age

By W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW

The Crisis in India

By SHERWOOD EDDY

The London Conference

By HARRISON BROWN

What Thinking Youth Most Want

By JAMES H. WEST

VOLUME CIV NUMBER 17

Chicago, January 13, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Sidney Strong, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Rossiter, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

Editors:

John Haynes Holmes — Francis Neilson
Curtis W. Reese — Louis L. Mann

UNITY is a weekly paper, sixteen pages containing timely editorial comment, special articles, foreign correspondence by its own representatives in Europe and Asia, book reviews, and regular reports of news from the field of liberal thought and action.

UNITY was the first American paper to discover Gandhi, of India. When the great Mahatma was unknown even to newspapers, UNITY hailed him as "the greatest man in the world." Its files contain the most complete record of Gandhi and his work that exists in this country. His autobiography, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth" is just completed.

UNITY was the first American paper to espouse and advocate the Outlawry of War, that remarkable peace program that is challenging the attention of the world.

UNITY has for more than forty years championed the idea of universal religion which finds in freedom the secret of unity and brotherhood, and it is today the outstanding organ of world religion.

Sample copies on request.

$3.00 per year.

700 Oakwood Boulevard **CHICAGO**

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 259
The New Mind for the New Age—W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW 261
Jottings—J. H. H. 263

ARTICLES—

The Crisis in India—SHERWOOD EDDY 263
The London Conference—HARRISON BROWN .. 265
Youth and the World—IV—What Thinking Youth Most Want—JAMES H. WEST 268

POETRY—

Lines for Humanists—*Walt Whitman* 259

THE STUDY TABLE—

Youth and Religion—SARAH JOSSELYN WILSON 269
One of the Ten Thousand Lives of Christ—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 270

CORRESPONDENCE—

Religion and Nationalism in India—DALJIT SINGH SADHARIA 270
Gandhi's Autobiography—W. B. CALKINS 271

THE FIELD—

An Invitation to New York Subscribers 271
An Appeal for Haiti 271
Two Great Physicians on the Liquor Question 271

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CIV MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 1930 NUMBER 17

LINES FOR HUMANISTS

"I write hymns,
I see the building of churches.
If I build God a church, it shall be a church to men and women;
If I write hymns, they shall be all to men and women;
If I become a devotee, it shall be to men and women."

—Walt Whitman.

The December 25th issue of the *Christian Century* contains an article on the Briand-Kellogg Treaty which should be missed by no student of the problem of getting rid of war. This article is written by Mr. S. O. Levinson, and is altogether the most important contribution to the literature of peace that this great leader has made since his earliest discussions of the Outlawry of War, and by the same token is one of the momentous utterances of the time upon this subject. Its appearance, like the appearance a decade ago of the first article on Outlawry in the *New Republic,* constitutes something like a new epoch in the history of the progress of the world toward peace. In this latest article, Mr. Levinson discusses the question of the "sanctions" behind the Kellogg Pact—the power to enforce it in the hour of crisis. On every hand we are told that the Treaty must be "implemented," to quote a useful if barbaric word. It must be given tools—i. e., weapons—to work its will for peace. There must be "teeth" in the document, by which is meant armies and navies to draw blood from the offender against its terms. But if resort is had to this method of keeping the peace of the world, then is peace being destroyed in the process. The "implementing" of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty with arms, in other words, is simply a return to the war system. It is the reestablishment of the very thing the Pact was proclaimed to end forever—namely, the settling of international disputes by force. For war is *war* whether it is fought by two nations to settle a dispute between themselves, or by all the other signatories of the Treaty as over against the one alleged offender against the Treaty. Fighting of any kind can have no place in a system of peace. It is the failure of the League of Nations to recognize this basic principle which has vitiated the Covenant from the beginning as an instrument for ending war. Yet there must be sanctions. A document such as the Briand-Kellogg Treaty cannot be left unsupported in the hour of crisis. What can or should be done when its integrity is threatened?

It is Mr. Levinson's answer to these questions which is contained in his *Christian Century* article fittingly entitled "The Sanctions of Peace." His supreme "sanction" is public opinion, now freed by the Peace Pact to function in the interest of peace. It is this public opinion, the supreme and ultimate reliance of any achievement for mankind in our democratic age, which must be "implemented." To this end Mr. Levinson submits four proposals or "sanctions of peace," which we have space only to list here in order, leaving our readers to seek the interpretation and advocacy of the four points in the original article itself (soon available in pamphlet form). First, he offers a sanction patterned on "Project 30" of the proposed codification of Pan-American international law (1925), as follows:

> In the future all annexations and territorial acquisitions by means of war or under the menace of war, or in the presence of armed force, and all seizures or exactions by force, duress or fraud shall be null and void.

The second sanction offered by Mr. Levinson is calculated to stir pacifists everywhere to enthusiasm and fresh conviction:

> Any person, or persons, who shall advocate orally or in writing, or cause the publication of any printed matter which shall advocate the use of war between nations, in violation of the terms of the Pact of Paris, with the intent of causing war between or among nations, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be imprisoned not less than ——— years.

The third sanction shows how the new World Court is destined to come into the picture of an ordered world:

> The World Peace Court should be given jurisdiction on the petition of an interested nation to investigate the charge of a breach of the Peace Pact. The court to have the power by the free consent of the nations to hear the case in a summary way, its doors open to the press and the public. The court to have no power to enforce its decisions, but merely to ascertain the facts and make reports and decisions in aid of public opinion.

Last in this blanket sanction:

> In case of the unfortunate action of any nation which amounts to an actual or immediately threatened breach of the Peace Pact, the signatories agree to communicate with one another fully and frankly in order to acquire the fullest knowledge of the situation, to consider the most efficient pacific measures to be taken jointly or separately to meet the exigencies of the particular situation and to tender friendly advice and offices to any or all the nations involved under the spirit of the Peace Pact. Such agreement to involve no commitment to armed force, no alliance, no obligation to join in any defense on the part of any signatory.

We commend these proposed "sanctions of peace" to

the earnest consideration of our readers. Has not S. O. Levinson conceived and written the second chapter of his great movement for the Outlawry of War?

Why is it that democratic governments have more trouble, and less success, with domestic than with foreign affairs? Macdonald's government in England is a perfect example of what we mean. The record of the Labor cabinet in the international field is one of wellnigh unbroken triumph. Snowden's shot at the Hague, which, like the shot at Concord bridge, went 'round the world—Macdonald's visit to America—Henderson's dismissal of Lord Lloyd in Egypt, and the granting of independence to that country—the lifting of the Mandate in Irak—the easing of the tension in India—the recognition of the Soviet Republic—these constitute a series of victories, broken only by the tragedy in Palestine, which would seem to insure Macdonald's continuance in office for an indefinite period. It all seems like a new and greater day for the British Empire. In domestic affairs, however, the record is by no means so bright. Indeed, there may be question as to whether there *is* any record at all. The mining bill is a compromise which does little credit to the party. Unemployment insurance has been weakly handled. As for unemployment itself, so little has been done that Thomas and his colleagues are in a position of constant defense against their own back benches. What is thus true of England is likewise true of the United States. Mr. Hoover's troubles are all at home—farm relief, the tariff, the stock exchange "crash," Prohibition, prison revolts, and crime generally. Abroad, however, the President has triumphed with his disarmament conference, his proposed commission of inquiry in Haiti, his improved relations with Latin America, and his excellent diplomatic appointments. Russia is a blot on the 'scutcheon in Washington, as Palestine is in London. But on the whole Mr. Hoover's foreign policies have been as successful as they have been wise. Does all this mean that we are moving steadily toward internationalism? If so, why should we be breaking down at home?

Under a two-column headline, a New York newspaper published the following story of what happened in Wall Street during the holidays. Here is the way the story ran:

> Wall Street workers, hard-pressed for weeks by the strain of the breaking market, won their reward in the richest harvest of bonuses in history.
>
> Estimates of the total bonus payments by banks, brokers and businesses allied with the Stock Exchange ranged from $250,000,000 to $500,000,000, an increase of some 25 per cent over last year.
>
> Some commission houses which profited from commissions while the market was going down, paid as high as 100 per cent salary bonuses.
>
> Most banks paid 10 per cent.

Ever since the epoch-making crash of early November, the question has been asked, Did Wall Street lose any money? Brokerage friends have assured us that the losses were terrific. Commission houses trembled for days on the verge of ruin; banks were face to face with utter disaster; individuals on the curb and in the exchange lost millions. All of which struck us at the time as so much "bunk"! And now we have the evidence of it revealed in the careless hilarity of the Christmas holidays. Think of it! Millions of individual investors lost fifty billions of dollars in a few days. Hundreds of thousands of humble men and women were sold out of everything they had in the world. Business was depressed, unemployment immeasurably increased, our whole prosperity placed in imminent peril. And Wall Street came out of it all with incalculable millions of profits *made "while the market was going down,"* and like a drunken sailor flung its illgotten gains among its underlings in the form of bonuses of unprecedented size! Do we need any further proof than this that the Stock Exchange is a den of thieves who grow rich on their plunderings from the people? Is it not obvious, in such a revelation as this, that the brokers and bankers, like the old railroad kings and corporation magnates, are just so many brigands licensed by law and custom to levy their toll upon the country's trade? The crash in Wall Street meant to the brokerage houses such profits as have never been reaped before in the nation's history. In the light of this scandal, we repeat our demand that the Stock Exchange be placed under drastic Congressional investigation to the end of securing a federal regulation which will rid us of this speculative piracy.

In no state has the study of Prohibition been carried on more systematically and scientifically than in the state of Massachusetts. Year after year the *Scientific Temperance Journal* has published the results of surveys of conditions. Last spring the *Journal* crowned its work by publishing the study of an analysis of temperance conditions in Massachusetts covering seven consecutive years before Prohibition went into effect and the first seven consecutive years thereafter. This study has just now been printed in the form of a most impressive pamphlet entitled "Fifteen Years of the Drink Question in Massachusetts," and is being widely distributed in preparation for the campaign now under way in the Old Bay State for the retention of the state enforcement law. The material is gathered from every phase of individual and social life. Here is complete statistical information on questions of public order, youth and family life, health, insanity and alcoholism, economic conditions, charitable relief, savings bank deposits, industry, etc., etc. So far as we can make out, there is no field of human life as touched by the liquor traffic which is not covered in the most thoroughgoing and impartial fashion in this elaborate

report. The conclusions are interesting. "The evidence here presented from a wide area of human relations," says the report, "justifies the conclusion that Massachusetts has already derived substantial benefits from national Prohibition of the liquor traffic. These benefits appear in public order, better health, homes better in their comforts and provision for care and the rearing of children, and a larger freedom for administering relief along constructive lines." The survey indicates, to make exact quotation, that "intemperance among the people as a whole is much less prevalent by every test offered by public records affected by individual drinking." It emphasizes the importance of the usually disregarded fact that "bootlegging" now takes the place of the illicit traffic which flourished in pre-prohibition days, and is thus "no new fact in the problem." Its final word declares that "when the whole range of facts is considered the net result of Prohibition to Massachusetts has been gain. The experience of the first Prohibition years indicates that a large freedom from drink losses won once can be won again, and increased, as methods of law enforcement are perfected and stabilized; especially, as the will to observe the law develops from increasing intelligence about the modern scientific facts as to the effects of alcohol, and from increasing desire for the common weal." The "wets" will make no reply to this great document, because no reply is possible.

The drawing of the color line is always unfortunate, even when it is drawn by negroes! There has come drifting to our desk an election circular widely distributed in Harlem, the negro section of New York, during the last municipal campaign. This circular reads as follows:

> If you want Harlem for the colored people vote against the white candidates of the Democratic party. Vote for Rivers and Moore—the colored candidates for the district. Vote against their white opponents of the Democratic party—Isaacs for Assembly and Kelly for Alderman.
>
> This election gives the colored voters the chance to drive the whites out of Harlem. Save Harlem for the colored people. We need room to expand. Don't let the whites push us out. Harlem belongs to the colored people. Keep it safe for ourselves by voting for the colored candidates.

This circular gave us a terrific jolt! Yet why should we have been surprised? Why should we suddenly expect black human nature to be angelic and perfect? For generations the whites have been outlawing the blacks from their august company. They have driven them from their schools and churches and neighborhoods—if they could, they would have driven them off of God's earth altogether. What more natural than that the negroes, suddenly finding themselves in dominant possession of one of the most desirable sections of New York, should now use their power to turn the tables on the whites? What is sauce for the goose may very well be sauce for the gander! There is a sort of terrible justice in this Harlem performance which gives a certain satisfaction to our primal instincts. But there is no progress here, no hope, no beauty. It is just the tragedy of history repeating itself, as though man learned nothing and was destined to get nowhere. We think we understand our negro brethren, and certainly we sympathize with them. But we deplore with a pain and even bitterness impossible to express this exhibition of race prejudice on the negro side of the line. Come, friends—shame the whites, and conquer them, by rising superior to their sins!

The New Mind for the New Age

Civilization is essentially a psychological quality. It is not, therefore, a co-operative conquest of raw nature by man, overcoming the natural handicaps of climate, distance and food scarcity. On the contrary, since civilization is essentially psychological, it is a co-operative process of building an ideal world wherein the individual may escape from the crushing, thwarting, grinding realities of life.

If civilization were merely the building of houses to shelter men from the elements, and the organization of individuals into social groups for the purpose of protection and the sharing of the fruits of individual labor, then there would be no distinction between man and the animal. For animals build places of shelter, whether it be beavers or rabbits. Even so do they organize their individual members into social groups for protection and the division of labor, as is evidenced by ants, bees and herds.

Civilization among man is therefore something vastly more than building houses, manufacturing tools and shrinking distances. At bottom it is a spiritual thing and consists in the art, literature, music, philosophy, science and religion—all of which are invisible—which man has created to make life bearable. Death, sorrow, fatigue, misfortune, sickness, grief and disappointment are terrible realities which no denial can gainsay.

Now, if all man had was physical comfort through physical protection from the raw elements, and nothing more, he could not bear his existence. Therefore, when these assail him he can escape into an ideal world which he has builded out of music, art, literature, philosophy, science and religion, and therewith life becomes meaningful and purposive. Here he is psychologically compensated for all his physical losses, his physical pains and his physical frustrations.

Naturally, therefore, the more man can make life bearable on this earth by the compensation, comfort and

understanding he gains through escape into this ideal world he has builded, the more civilized he becomes. Thus, the real civilatory factors are not physical but psychological, not material but spiritual, not visible but invisible. It is therefore the business of education with its music, art, science and religion to build more and more a finer, truer and more effective civilization which is not expressive of bulk but of quality.

To prove that civilization is basically psychological and not physical; all we need do is ask, what marks the difference between yesterday and today, between the civilization of the past and that of today? The peoples of yesterday had buildings to shelter them, so do we; they had tools to fashion articles, so have we; they manufactured goods to sell, so do we; they educated their children, so do we. Suppose we say that the difference between the buildings of yesterday, and today, on the whole, is in the invisible ideal they express in their architecture with reference to human life. That is an invisible thing. The difference between the tools of yesterday and today is not in their degrees of efficiency, but in the use to which they are put relative to human life. The difference between the manufacture of yesterday and today is the end for which it is produced, relative to human life, namely service.

On the whole this age is different, and therefore new, because of the invisible—the spiritual end—for which it functions.

Thus, this age is different because it represents the triumph of invisible powers, namely ideas, over visible forces and concrete matter in the form of definite obstacles. Every age heretofore, since man became a human being, represented the increasing triumph of muscle and brawn over impeding concrete situations. If rock was to be quarried it was muscle and brawn that did it. If bridges were to be swung, it was muscle and brawn again that did it. If floods were to be averted, it was yet again muscle and brawn that did it. And so on with all the definite impediments of man. Then came this new power of invisible ideas, and man put ideas to work. Today ideas are incarnated in machines quarrying rocks, swinging bridges, plowing fields and averting floods. Ideas do the work of man! Ideas rule the world! The idea is the new monarch!

Now, just as the triumph of ideas marks the greatest achievement since the dawn of time, even so does it constitute the greatest danger man has ever yet faced. Once man was a slave to matter, to circumstance, to his age-old enemies of hunger, cold, famine, flood, disease, drudgery, fatigue, distance, circumstance and want. Today he is the undisputed lord of creation —with growing limitations!

But just as he has used ideas to enslave matter, and thus have matter do his bidding, even so the danger is that the tangible products which have resulted from the machines that his ideas made, will in turn enslave him, and return him once again to the slime from which he once emerged. Ideas build machines, machines produce tangible things, things produce profits, profits purchase physical comfort, luxury, indulgence, ease, and these in turn enslave, degrade and outrage the ideas of beauty, justice, righteousness, mercy, goodness, tolerance, brotherhood. What men want from these machines which ideas have enslaved is more pleasurable physical reactions which come through indulgence.

This is the threat of materialism we face today. It is a tyranny worse and more dehumanizing than any of by-gone days. It is the threat of returning to a slavery from which man climbed through great effort and at a great cost. And the collapse of civilization we hear so much about today is not a collapse of houses, or economic systems and types of government; rather it is a collapse of a process of emancipation from slavery to matter which has been going on for centuries. Ultimately, a people's ethics, principles, motives and ideals are determined by those ends for which they work and live, and by those things they hold to be of supreme value.

"Whate'er thou lovest man, that too become thou must; God if thou lovest God, dust if thou lovest dust."

The development of a technique that will teach us how to transcend ultimate matter, namely tangible things, is the greatest and most imperative need of our age. To help develop this technique is the supreme business of present-day education and religion. We have a new age—the age of dominance of ideas. Thus, the imperative demand is a new mind that can guide and preserve this new age.

This new mind must be of all things questful of relative values, and at the same time enthrone the evaluation and enhancement of human personality as an end in itself to be the ultimate objective to which all control and use of material things is put. The East may contemplate the flea, while the West swats it, thus transcending the material discomfort of its bite. But do we make chairs to sit on, or to sell? Do we make clothes to enhance human life, or for profit? Do we educate youth to preserve a certain economic system, or to enrich human life?

If we do the latter in each instance, we are crassly materialistic, enslaved by material ends, and therefore no farther advanced in our spiritual freedom than the ancient savage who was dominated by hunger, cold, and other elemental forces over which he had no control. In the end human life with its hunger for beauty, justice, love, mercy, goodwill, is being no more stifled by our age than it was for the savage—mayhap less!

Aristotle, the high priest of humanitarianism, said that the end of education, of the state and of religion was to cultivate a love of excellence. St. Paul said, "Whatsoever things are honorable, just, pure, lovely

and of good report, think on these things." Live by these things, make these things the end for which the state, education and all business function. Both are right. Unless we use our profits, our inventions, our genius, our knowledge to make life more excellent, and therefore eternally worth while, we shall return to the pit from which we have climbed, and the ooze of the mire will close in over our heads, leaving only a haunting might of despair in our hearts.

W. Waldemar W. Argow.

Jottings

Since our report of the distinguished dead of 1929, published in our December 30th issue, the following have died: Emile Loubet, ex-President of the French Republic, and Gilbert E. Roe, radical lawyer, friend and partner of the late Senator LaFollette.

A recent 1929 survey recorded progress in business, politics, aviation, science, literature, and sport. Apparently religion doesn't exist, or else it is not progressing any. Either horn of the dilemma seems a bit exciting.

On Christmas Day we received from a "wet" friend "jubilatory greetings" in honor of the birthday of "the wine-maker of Cana." This is an interesting style of remembrance. It should be extended to the 22nd of February, and all Americans asked to celebrate the birthday of the slave-holder of Mt. Vernon!

An Indian agitator was recently arrested and fined 1,000 Rupees (heavy for India) for publishing and distributing a poster bearing Lincoln's statement in his first Inaugural Address,

> Whenever the people shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to overthrow it.

This sentiment has not always been popular even in America!

Abolishing battleships today seems to us just like abolishing battle-axes after gun-powder was discovered. If this is all the London disarmament conference is going to accomplish, why bother to hold it at all?

Here is terrible news! Papini is writing a biography of St. Augustine. Remembering with still lively sensations of nausea Papini's "Life of Christ," we feel profoundest sympathy for the late Bishop of Hippo.

J. H. H.

The Crisis in India

As I return to India after an absence of five years I find many striking changes here. The most striking of all is the change in the political sphere, in the widespread demand for self-government and the growing distrust of Great Britain. The Calcutta *Statesman* writes: "It is the loss of faith in Britain which of late years has poisoned life in India." All the Indian leaders whom we have interviewed are agreed upon one thing; not one of them wants a continuation of the present relationship to Great Britain. All want either early Dominion status like that of Canada, or complete independence like the United States.

Let me give by way of background my first impression of the present situation in India. During recent weeks since landing, we have interviewed Indian and foreign leaders of every shade of political thought. By a strange coincidence we interviewed on two succeeding days the Viceroy and the radical Indian leader who absolutely opposes his policy, Mr. Jawahar Lal Nehru. We spent two delightful days with Mr. Nehru in his palatial residence in Allahabad. He is a fine-featured Brahman, with a highly intelligent, sensitive, sad face, a perfect gentleman of English training at Harrow and Cambridge. He was clad in the coarse homespun that is the badge of certain Indian nationalists today. He is the leader of the left wing party, standing for full independence for India, of the organized radical youth movement and to some extent of the Trade Union movement of the industrial workers. He has been twice in prison and, like Mr. Gandhi in the past, he is probably destined to spend time there in the future. As perfect a gentleman as the Viceroy, he is a man of high honour, of sensitive conscience, holding very much the same attitude to the British Empire as Thomas Jefferson did in 1776. On the last day of our stay in his home we lunched with Mr. Nehru and the next day with the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, who generously gave us an hour and a half of his busy time.

I was deeply impressed by the character of Lord Irwin who has won a greater measure of confidence than any Viceroy in India during the present generation. He is first and foremost a genuine Christian, and the simple sincerity of his religious faith has impressed all India. Tall, homely, I found in him a humility and tenderness strangely suggestive of Abraham Lincoln. Both the Viceroy and Mr. Nehru spoke with candor and great frankness but I am not at liberty to quote a word they said. May I instead state the case as fairly as I can of the British in India, of their opponents the left wing nationalists, and finally of that incalculable and powerful personality, Mahatma Gandhi, who, during his own life-time, holds the affection of more millions than any living man.

The British might state their case in the words of the *Statesman* as follows: "We came as traders and adventurers wishing to make money. We were against

our will drawn into politics and wars. . . . In the end we found ourselves rulers of the country and realized we had been used for a higher purpose than our own. We then began to talk about our moral mission." The British have built up an able Civil Service with the highest standards in the world. The greatest road-builders since the Romans, they have extended their great highways and 40,000 miles of railway across this vast sub-continent. They have a splendid system of irrigation and can point to 28,000,000 acres irrigated by the Government. They have mitigated the ravages of famine and have built up a system of insurance to save the people from this recurring menace. They have invested five billion dollars in industry, railways and productive investments in India. The trade of India has increased since 1858 more than tenfold. They can point to an educational system with over eleven millions in schools. They have united this vast sub-continent containing a fifth of the human race, divided between eight religions, 222 different languages, 2300 different castes and sub-castes, into a new national unity. Above all Britain points to the Pax Britanica where, after 1300 years of wars and invasions which smashed the political and economic fabric of the land, Britain has enabled a united India to face her external and internal foes. The writer can personally testify after fifteen years in India that with all their faults he knows of no finer instance in history of the government of one people by another. All this and much more may be said for the British case.

In reply to this claim of Great Britain, the Indian Nationalist would state his case somewhat as follows: "We admit many of the material benefits of British rule. Some of our number would even say that no foreign Government could be better. Yet we must point out that imperialism inevitably exploits the weak and that we have been exploited in the interests of Britain. However good the Government we believe with her former Prime Minister that 'good government is no substitute for self-government.' The British writer, Sir John Seeley, says: *'Subjection for a long time to a foreign yoke is one of the most potent causes of national deterioration.'* "

We Indians have benefited in many ways materially under British rule but we have been morally undermined by the process. Even materially we have suffered at many points. Take for illustration our cotton trade. Britain allowed Lancashire to kill this profitable Indian cottage industry but built up no adequate modern factories here to take its place. Cotton is only one of our industries that have been sacrificed. We also object to the "drain" of $200,000,000 a year from India to England in salaries, pensions and interest on foreign loans. The total "drain" from India to Britain according to William Digby has been the enormous total of thirty billion dollars.

In a land of extreme poverty where millions have not enough to eat, where the average income per capita is only $27.75 a year, or less than eight cents a day, Britain has imposed the highest paid civil service in the world. The Viceroy receives more than the President of the United States; the cabinet members, the judges, the governors and the whole foreign service are more highly paid than similar positions in America. For the costly Viceroy's palace and buildings of New Delhi the wasteful extravagance of $55,000,000 has been sanctioned.

The cost of the Army has been a sore point with India consuming for a decade from a third to a half of the entire budget of the country, depleting all the other services including education. India has to provide some $2,000,000 a year for a small expensive army of less than 250,000 men, while Japan at less cost maintains an army of 400,000 men and the third strongest navy in the world. Britain has imperially governed India with no adequate training for self-government as though she intended to stay forever.

You say that there are over eleven millions in the schools but you neglect to mention that only one-fifth of the children are in school, that 92 per cent of the population is still illiterate, that this foreign system of education is the most academic and utterly divorced from practical life in all the world.

We also protest against the policy of a foreign rule which by its communal electorates, etc., aims to divide us and has artificially fomented divisions and strife between the 220,000,000 Hindus and 70,000,000 Mohammedans. But more than all, we protest against the racial discrimination of an insufferable Anglo-Saxon superiority so galling, so humiliating that it leaves a lasting inferiority complex and the bitter determination to throw off this almost universally hated foreign yoke. We do not deny the Pax Britanica and many material benefits of a foreign rule, but on the whole we deeply and unitedly feel that India has been steadily exploited for the sake of Britain and the Empire.

Mr. Gandhi, who more than any living man voices the heart both of the leaders and the inarticulate masses of India, says:

My whole soul has risen against the existing system of government because I believe that there is no real freedom for India under the British connection, if Englishmen cannot give up the fetish of their predestined superiority. . . We have cooperated long enough in our own degradation. It is our duty to refuse to do so any longer.

Those words represent the deepest feeling of the educated leaders, practically the whole student body, the growing Trade Union Movement, and to an increasing extent even of the masses in India today. Such is the case of the Indian nationalist which he feels passionately and is now prepared at all costs to support.

Broadly the main line of cleavage in Indian politics today is between the older and younger generations. On the right, most of the older men of the Victorian era desire non-violent constitutional progress within the Empire. They can be united by Mahatma Gandhi or others upon some compromise for the policy of early Dominion status. On the left are the younger men, the youth movement, the inarticulate but growing Trade Union Movement of labor, and the left wing leaders like Mr. Nehru. They stand for an independent Republic won by their own efforts, by any means, violent or non-violent.

It should be remembered that two years ago the National Congress at Madras adopted a resolution in favor of complete independence for India. A year ago at the Calcutta Congress, against Mr. Nehru's plea for independence, Gandhi by his enormous influence carried a resolution by 1350 to 973 votes in favor of the proposed constitution on the basis of Dominion status similar to Canada. Mr. Gandhi's resolution read:

This Congress will adopt the Constitution (for Dominion status) if it is accepted in its entirety by the British Parliament on or before December 31st, 1929, but in the event of its non-acceptance by that date the Congress will organize a campaign of non-violent non-cooperation by advising the country to refuse taxation and in such other manner as may be decided upon.

If this position is maintained at the Lahore Congress and they do not accept the indefinite promise of Dominion status "in the fullness of time," then the Congress will probably swing to the left, a campaign of non-cooperation will be inaugurated and youth will probably engage in all kinds of crimes of violence. This will call forth stern repression to maintain law and order on the part of the Government. With the military in power some man of the stamp of General Dyer, who shot down hundreds of unarmed Indians in the Amritsar massacre of 1919, will probably again emerge. The result will be increasing bitterness, grow-

ing violence and an even larger number going to prison than the 30,000 who were arrested in 1921. If India chooses the path of violence, even though under Mr. Gandhi's slogan of "non-violence," the situation will be grave indeed. The 320,000,000 Indians against the 163,000 of the British community here may seek to follow the path of the American Colonies in 1776, instead of that of Canada for Dominion status within the Empire.

The question is, has the Viceroy's announcement come too late to stay the tide of growing distrust, unrest and revolt which is rising against the British Government in India? In his announcement of November 1, 1929, he offers a round table conference to give opportunity for Indian opinion to express itself concerning the new constitution for India, and concludes: "I am authorized on behalf of His Majesty's Government to state clearly that . . . the natural issue of India's Constitutional progress is the attainment of Dominion status." This announcement rallied all liberal and moderate elements in India and some of the nationalists for a time, but following the debates in the British Parliament the tide of confidence has ebbed again and public opinion in India is now swinging to the left. The National Congress leaders have this week reaffirmed the demands of their manifesto in response to the Viceroy's offer, asking for a change of spirit and a policy of general conciliation on the part of the Government, general amnesty for political prisoners, and the adequate representation of the Congress Party at the proposed round table conference. Mr. Gandhi has not yet taken his stand. With his enormous influence he may unite the majority of the Congress upon some compromise, or fall back upon his Calcutta resolution for "a campaign of non-violent non-cooperation" which means chaos and revolt for youth and labor. At present it looks as though India were swinging to the left for complete independence.* I believe the situation is far more serious than is realized in Great Britain or America.

SHERWOOD EDDY.

Lahore, India.

*Since the above was written, the Lahore Congress has met and, under Gandhi's leadership, declared for national independence. The situation is critical.—EDITOR.

The London Conference

Amid all the varying hopes and opinions now being expressed on both sides of the Atlantic it is coming to be realized that the Naval Conference which will begin at London in January is the most important international conference since 1919. Ostensibly it is to deal with technicalities, in reality it will be governed by political considerations, for, as President Hoover and Mr. MacDonald have begun to show the world, problems involving strategical considerations must be solved, if at all, by agreement between statesmen and not between experts.

The Washington Conference of 1922 in fixing a limit for battleships and battle cruisers left open the far more difficult question of cruiser building, and, basing their action on the same old war mentality, each Admiralty set out to obtain maximum strength for itself in all categories of ships left unrestricted. Since most naval experts now agree that battleships are practically useless all that the Washington Conference can be said to have done is to have prevented the wastage of vast sums of public money. The abortive Geneva Conference of 1927 proved to be a dangerous fiasco, in the absence of political preparation it was handled solely by the experts and their spokesmen and served as an irritant to public opinion in England and the United States, which irritation went on increasing so long as the Coolidge and Tory regimes lasted.

The situation has now been completely changed by the facts that in the interim the Peace Pact has become an international treaty and the Hoover-MacDonald conversations have resulted in its being declared the basis of their respective foreign policies.

As between themselves the United States and Britain have agreed roughly to accept as parity a total cruiser tonnage of about 315,000 tons for the former and 339,000 tons for Britain, the disparity in the total being balanced by the allotment to the United States of a few more 10,000 ton cruisers than Britain will have. But the important thing is that the two countries have each arrived at these approximate figures by ignoring the other as a possible opponent. In other words "parity" has been agreed to for political reasons and not primarily to prevent one from attacking the other, a possibility which was ruled out of consideration. And what of the other three Parties to the Conference? Japan wants an increase in her cruiser ratio and it is possible that, since such increase would give her parity with Britain, the latter country might object under pressure from the Dominions. Italy demands parity with France; she is willing to reduce her naval armament, says Mussolini, to any figure providing it is not less than the strongest Continental nation. This however France objects to, urging as reasons her far more scattered colonial Empire, the necessity for being able to convoy native troops across the Mediterranean to defend France against Germany, and the fact that her coast lines are widely separated, facing North and West to the Channel and the Atlantic, and South to the Mediterranean. France too has accepted to attend the Conference only on the understanding that submarines shall not be abolished and that naval, land and air armaments shall be treated as interdependent.

This very superficial list of the problems to be faced at London is sufficient warning that we are not yet on the eve of "disarmament." One fact is obvious, that none of the participants are entering the Conference in the spirit of the Peace Pact excepting the United States and Britain, and they are only doing so in relation to each other. Japan and the United States have both signed the Pact but, so far as we know, there has been no agreement between them to use this fact as the basic consideration in the establishment of their respective necessary armaments, nor has there been between France and Britain nor between Italy and France. And yet that is the only basis upon which any real agreement can take place. France insists that the conclusions of the London Conference shall not become

operative until approved by the General Disarmament Conference to be held later. In so far as this is a recognition of the necessary interdependence of modern armaments there is something to be said for it. There is a deal of bunk talked and written about reducing the danger of war by mere reduction of navies. Of the three arms of modern warfare the naval may safely be said to be the least aggressive. You cannot invade a country with cruisers and though it is true that a nation such as England can be starved out by submarines in a few weeks it is today even more certain that her industrial arteries can be cut and her population panic-stricken in a few hours by air attack. In 1915 behind the British lines I remember watching with amusement a bombing raid by two German planes, they flew low and we could see the men in them releasing their little football bombs. But by 1918 air raids were no longer much fun and since then there has been a lot of "progress" so that, with the Atlantic crossed some half dozen times, it is obvious that we are only at the beginning of the conquest of the air. General security requires the reduction of all armaments.

But it is permissible to think that France is not necessarily wishing to ensure all round disarmament by this insistence on the interdependence of war weapons, and to reach this conclusion one need not attend to the howlings of the Paris press, which is unanimously opposed to the coming conference. The record of France at previous conferences is quite sufficient. Although France is looked upon as the possible disturbing factor at London it would be unfair to lay all the blame on one government. She is in this matter the mouthpiece of all Europe excepting the compulsorily disarmed nations. The European Governments have as yet little confidence in each other and therefore their attitude towards the Peace Pact is chiefly one of lip service. It is not that they are empty-headed jingoes in the sense of the Chicago *Tribune*. There is little of that in responsible quarters today and none that constitutes a menace. It is the old story of security. It is easy for the cosmopolitan to sneer, he may have some right to do so if the accident of his birth in a particular country has come to mean so little to him that the flag under which he lives is really of no importance. But most people do not feel that way and governments have to deal accordingly, even though it must be admitted they need no urging.

But once recognize the principle and one is already excusing France. In the West a sense of security has been attained in some measure, in Europe none, except by France who claims to feel herself secure today by reason of her overwhelmingly superior organization for war. And it is that sense of security, as France sees it, which is now threatened. It is idle to point to the lesson of history and to say that supremacy is never permanent and security only real when all feel equally secure, the answer simply is: "If you don't want us to rely on our own armaments then give us a written promise to defend us if we get into trouble." If an American paper can even think it worth while to try to scare Americans with childish twaddle about the "menace" of insignificant naval bases at Bermuda and Halifax it is obviously easier for Frenchmen to be scared by yarns of more "unprovoked aggression" on her land frontiers. These absurdities are the measure of popular ignorance of all the chief factors which govern their lives, so long as they exist fear can stalk abroad and with fear about anything may happen. Owing to our close knit economic and financial system war has become unworkable, but, so long as it is being prepared for, it has not become unthinkable. On the contrary it is pretty sure to come unless there is a real reduction of armaments based upon an entire change in the fashion of international thinking.

Here it may be as well to remind ourselves that the conference in January is not for disarmament but merely for limitation, it is to fix a point above which we will not go in certain armaments. We have not even begun to plan for general reduction much less for "disarmament" as the ordinary man who pays the bill would understand it. In fact all that Hoover and MacDonald have done is to turn their backs on the bad old way of thinking—but they are still facing the new way alone. The energy, courage and careful preparation required before even this slight but essential step could be taken is evidence of the magnitude of the task still before sane world opinion.

For ten years France and her Allies have successfully concentrated the attention of the world on the necessity for providing for their security, on the basis of the historical myth that France herself has always been guiltless of any share in the troubles which have visited the Continent. So long as a Government can successfully conceal the misdeeds of its predecessors from their common dupes it can continue to exploit the fear of "aggression." But even so, France's claim to a fleet sufficient to defend all its shores at once is in excess even of her pre-war demands. Those who have read the diplomatic history of 1914 know that one of the chief arguments for British intervention given by the French Ambassador to Grey was that France had concentrated the bulk of her fleet in the Mediterranean, trusting to Britain to defend her northern coasts against possible attack by Germany. And yet at that time France had not even an alliance with England, only an "understanding" between the military and naval staffs of the two countries fostered by a Foreign Secretary who was working secretly against the known desires of a sentimentally peaceful Liberal Government. If France could take such a risk when Germany possessed the second most powerful navy in the world it is a strange commentary on her professed faith in the League Covenant, Locarno with its sanction, and the Peace Pact if she feels that today she must be prepared for simultaneous combat on both fronts.

This claim is in fact a pointer to the situation, America has declared bluntly against sanctions, Britain cannot and will not give guarantees involving the possibility of friction with the United States; France and her Allies believe in the status quo and no reduction of armaments beyond the scrapping of obsolete weapons, and by demanding further "guarantees" can short-circuit the Conference. The nations have reached the cross roads at last; after a decade of quibbling the new policy faces the old nakedly, one way puts the maintenance of the status quo before peace but seeks to keep both by force, alliances and the inevitable balance of power, the other recognizes that the eventual revision of treaties is the essence of history and calls for reliance upon international conventions, an international Court of Law and the development of world consciousness. There is in this naked exposure the advantage that the half-concealed tug-of-war between the two principles which has been going on for so long must now end and the struggle be continued in the open under the glare of publicity. For this too of course we have to thank

the Peace Pact. President Hoover and the Prime Minister have made it abundantly clear that the Conference is being called as a result of the signature of that Pact, the fundamental question which faces it therefore is, are all the nations prepared to live up to their pledges? If so reduction of armaments becomes possible, if not the London Conference must fail as the others have done.

But how to give France and her friends a feeling of security sufficient to "enable" her to reduce her armaments, and thereby lessen the feeling of insecurity which prevails among those neighbors of France which are not fortunate enough to be her friends?

First of all it is up to France to realize that the game of bluff is played out, subservience to ultra-nationalism in general and particularly in France has held up the world long enough. The legitimate anxieties of France must be listened to whether they seem exaggerated or not, but she must excommunicate from her counsels her Marins and Franklin-Bouillons, as England is deflating her Lord Lloyds and Birkenheads and the United States her Hi Johnsons and Jim Reeds. The problem of world peace can only be solved by reason and common sense and those whose heads are full of ignorance and prejudice in varying degrees have no place in such counsels.

In their essence the new policy and the old are irreconcilable and since Governments are not given to bare-faced surrender of their points of view the outlook would not seem to permit of much hope but for the fact that, in these days, Governments are also becoming shy of flouting too openly the peace desires of a war weary public. In his Armistice Day speech Mr. Hoover made a statement which has not received sufficient attention. I refer to the part in which he said:

> What we urgently need in this direction is a further development of methods for the reference of unsettled controversies to joint enquiry by the parties, assisted by friendly nations, in order that action may be stayed and that the aggressor may be subjected to the searchlight of public opinion.

There is plentiful scope for examination of this suggestion. Much is made in certain quarters of the fact that the Pact has involved the United States in no "commitment," meaning that she has thereby undertaken no engagement to punish a nation which transgresses the Pact. But Senator Borah and many others have declared that she could not be indifferent to such a breach. It should be possible to find a means whereby the United States would associate itself with an *ad hoc* Commission of Enquiry into the facts of a threatened breach of the peace, on the lines, as Judge Hughes has suggested, of the Conference which would be called under the Four Power Treaty to deal with a dangerous situation in the Pacific. This would involve no impossible commitment in advance to "join a foreign war," nor would it imply the acceptance of any designation of a criminal nation already arrived at by an outside body; it would however associate the United States with what all intelligent Americans recognize as vital to her well-being and prosperity—the prevention of a war situation arising.

The precise way in which the "development of methods" spoken of by Mr. Hoover can be achieved is a matter which touches the American Constitution and for that reason it is preferable and is much to be desired that the matter should be subjected to discussion among American publicists. It is sufficient to say that the certainty of a Conference with the United States participating would go very far towards laying the bogey of "unprovoked aggression" and would thereby both help to stabilize Europe and to further expose such of these fears as are fictitious and based solely on the pretentions of professional militarists.

Nor must it be forgotten that the acceptance of the Optional Clause of the World Court Statute by the chief European nations has already narrowed the field of dangerous controversy for those Governments which are willing to admit as much to their peoples. If the promise of Mr. Hoover's message to Congress results in the speedy ratification of the Court Protocol by the United States Senate a further great step towards the stabilization of the world will have been taken. Thanks to the wonderful work again done by Mr. Levinson in Europe this summer there is now no shadow of an excuse for reasonable opposition to American entry into the Court. Not only are American interests fully protected by the Root Formula but matters of principle which aroused such keen debate in 1926 have now been fully met. These matters chiefly concerned the power of the League Council to obtain advisory opinions on the legal aspect of political questions submitted to it, and particularly of an alleged power to obtain an opinion without the consent of both parties. It is to Mr. Levinson that we owe the ruling of the new Court Statute that "procedure with regard to advisory opinions shall be the same as in contentious cases," i. e. that both parties must submit their case before an opinion will be given by the Court. In regard to the other hotly disputed point, the Report to the League Assembly on the question of United States adherence definitely says that the Council has no power even to propose measures for the enforcement of advisory opinions. These changes, taken in conjunction with the British Resolution calling upon the Assembly to amend the Covenant in accordance with the Peace Pact should persuade all but the incorrigible ultra-nationalist that a majority in Europe wants what the United States wants—peace, and that in so far as co-operation is desired it is not in order to inveigle America into war but to help to keep the world from falling back into barbarism and universal ruin.

Success at London then will not ensure disarmament but it will open the way towards it and it would constitute a triumph not only for the Pact but for enlightened French statesmanship.

Of one thing we may be sure, that any policy of mere obstruction would be short-lived, movement there must be either forward or backward. Checks there may be, disappointments and difficulties we are sure to encounter but eventual failure there cannot be. The lowest common multiple of human intelligence has to be reckoned with, but to reduce all humanity to that level is a cynical exaggeration, the Peace Pact has come to stay and to triumph. To quote General Smuts in a recent speech at Oxford:

> The future is to those nations which unreservedly accept the new situation. The emotional and imprudent may continue to think along the old lines, wasting their treasure and their substance to no purpose, sacrificing their national well-being and running the risk of eventually bumping their heads severely. But the ultimate result is a foregone conclusion, and war will inevitably disappear from the civilized practice of the world.

HARRISON BROWN.

Youth and the World

What Thinking Youth Most Want

What is it in particular that the youth of today most want? What are the down-dragging burdens they would strike from men's shoulders? Those burdens are, of course, the wrong and pain in the world; the world's still continuing wrong and pain, though seers and prophets have urged during centuries their dispelling and have tried to point the redemptive way. Hitherto mankind has not responded to the age-long call in any effective mode or felt co-operative responsibility. Thus the world's wrong and pain are still what eager youth today, with added fervor, would alleviate and, if possible, wholly expel from human experience.

The world's wrong and pain! A big job to expel them! but, in large part at least, not impossible under mankind's new consciousness of humanity's solidarity and with all the better aids that scientific knowledge and continuous research are putting within human grasp. It is the apparent feasibility of at least their considerable diminution which makes the persistent continuance of so much wrong and pain in human life so unbearable to quick youth now.

Of "wrongs" on earth there are, without question, many varieties to be eliminated. Surely not war alone, though so much attention is being given today to the ending of war that we are apt to forget that war is only a symptom of a monstrous antecedent wrong which must itself first be eliminated before wars shall wholly cease. One of Andrew Carnegie's wise generalizations was the following, in his own simple language: "Things are not organized here as they ought to be and might be." Is it not highly interesting, as well as suggestive to effort, that one of the world's greatest "money masters" saw clearly, and candidly expressed his conviction, that many things as they now are on earth are "out of joint"? A prominent editorial comment at the time was: "Andrew Carnegie's finding is true to many things as they now are in this world of ours."

Mr. Carnegie, however, didn't fathom quite clearly enough how the remedy must come, and how only it can come. His first job when he got to heaven, he said, would be to tell God about it, and have God set matters right. It never occurred to him that man himself can do the business, and do it now quicker than the many millions of years that Nature has already used in bringing man along far enough to grasp his own powers as he today has discovered and is utilizing them. It is today the exalted mission and the joy—not the "cursed spite," as the Shakespeare writings would have it—of every right-thinking youth, to deem himself without doubt "born to set things right." And the youth of the world, working co-operatively together and with Nature, can do it.

The teeming luxuriance and productivity of the earth, properly increased and utilized, and justly distributed, would rapidly tend to the complete prosperity and health of man, to his mental and spiritual opportunity, and to world-peace, around the entire globe, no man or woman or child on the earth's surface being omitted or forgotten, whether in Boston or Bokhara; whether in Salem, "the city of peace," or in Sing-Sing, the abode of the damned; whether in Newport or Nazareth or Nigeria. And with every man and woman happy under their own vine and fig-tree (which phrase is of course symbolic: I say this for the sake of the literal-minded), what occasion or likelihood would there be for the horrid spectre of War to arise?

Let the keen-minded scientist, the inventive chemical engineer, henceforth use his fine powers not for the combination of deadly gases for the extermination of his fellow-beings, or for blowing them to shreds, but for the intensive creation of pleasant food and comfortable homes for them. They are his sisters and his brothers, and their happiness, not their torment or destruction, should be his divine intent.

As for disease and the physical pain in the world, these are, to one who acutely realizes even an iota of their extent, a problem utterly beyond the patient passivity with which the majority of favorably conditioned people apparently accept them as all right for others. Sir Edmund Gosse a few years ago realized the problem forcibly enough in his own family's experience, and in his book, "Father and Son," he freely expressed himself:

> My early experiences (he writes referring to himself as a child of seven years) made me singularly conscious, at an age when one should know nothing about these things, of that torrent of sorrow and anguish and terror which flows under all the footsteps of man. Within my childish conscience, already some dim inquiry was awake as to the meaning of this mystery of pain.

Mr. Gosse offered no explanation of pain's "meaning" in the world; and, wisely, he did not suggest any quick magical panacea for its complete "cure." So far as medical and surgical discoveries, inventions, appliances, and anaesthetics have their great office in the world's partial relief, he naturally recognized the marvelous mitigations which these have brought within a generation. The mitigations have indeed been great, compared with what men staggered under and sank under in earlier times, and even so recently as a hundred years ago. There is high encouragement in this fact, as well as inspiration to further endeavor in the same line on the part of the noble youth of today who stand ready, in the laboratory of the bio-chemist and of the physicist, to give their life-work to man's bodily relief and perfection. It is but futile comfort, and a mockery of the idea of "divine beneficence," to assert that pain is a good. The frequent arguments in its favor, as "a means of spiritual growth," and as the means God or Nature has taken to lead the animal world, including man, upward and onward from lower to higher, are far from satisfying. Rather than stultifying our reason and our idea of morality by accepting evil as a means to good, is it not better to look at pain as wholly unmoral; as neither a good nor an evil in itself; look at it simply and clearly as an undesirable feature in Nature and in human life, inimical to man's best growth and happiness, and to be got rid of so far as possible, and as quickly as possible, so that the energy and vitality it absorbs may be utilized in nobler ways. Man needs to come more nearly into accord with his environment, or to bring his environment more into accord with himself and his needs.

> The Path! The Path! It has been one of pain,
> But must it be so always? Must the rise
> Of men and nations towards the spirit's skies
> Be ever only under Sorrow's reign?

Shall not man's growing insight yet attain
A thornless pathway up to Being's prize,
And soul's revealing airs anoint man's eyes
Till pangless harmony with good lies plain?
O happy Age, when ignorance lies dead,
When want and greed have fled their noisome place,
And passion, chained by will, seeks heights above!
In this sweet Path, O Earth, thy sons be led,
Till Pain's long rule shall pass, and strength and grace
Be won through sight of beauty and through love.

Is it not on this loftier track that our high-minded and purposeful youth of today should run their energetic race, in so far as their life-work tends in the direction of man's physiological rightness? The simple things of proper diet, proper drink, proper outdoor air, proper amount and condition of labor, proper intellectual activity, proper spiritual insight, proper vision of inward and outward beauty, with wise moderation in all matters of self-indulgence; in a word, the faithful acceptance and following of the Tennysonian trinity of nobleness—"Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,"—the simple, normal living that would be gradually possible for the race if properly sought by those competent to this end, the same being then made available (as it might be made available under simple and proper world-justice) for the whole human family—this would, in two or three successive generations of man's life on earth, reduce disease and pain nine-tenths.

The youth of today have before them a marvelous opportunity; a thousand opportunities, such as the world never before offered—socially, scientifically, hygienically, internationally. Do young men and women seek noble adventure? high emprise? Would they help mankind on? The way is open to them. And going out gloriously upon their mission, these youthful lofty adventurers—if they are faithful to their high call—will in time triumphantly near port; that port of peace on earth and universal good which the world has sought age-long, but has heretofore always failed of.

JAMES H. WEST.

The Study Table

Youth and Religion

"You young people come here tied to your mother's apron strings. Now it's my business to knock the pins out from under you and make you swim; and if you can't swim, then, damn it, you ought to drown."

This is a challenging quotation with which to open a book. There is something about a good "damn," forcefully expressed, that gathers interest as a magnet gathers needles. We all come running to see what the outburst is about.

But the most amazing thing about this book* is that such a treatise should still be needed in our day. That we are so slow to remove festering appendices and tonsils from the otherwise healthy, growing body of our religious beliefs will be, in years to come, one of the marvels of this age. Dr. Halliday has, however, proved himself a capable surgeon. Anxious guardians of the patient will watch the work of the knife with a certain amount of dread, for he cuts quickly and decisively. But, in the mind of this reviewer, at least, he has harmed no single vital organ. With the hampering decayed obstructions removed, life pulses richly and vigorously through the cleaned organism, and promises a long period of splendid virile activity.

It is this promise which seems to fire Dr. Halliday as he writes. His is the hopeful, constructive attitude, as opposed to the pessimistic reactions of an inadequate, defeated theology. Youth, he claims, is not at fault in its striving. The burden of defense rests rather upon the fears and intellectual dishonesty of those churches and clergy who will not meet the situation constructively, those whose minds are so steeped in the mental peace of an outgrown period that they cannot see the challenge of the present, a challenge based upon a fresh interpretation of the deep unchanging realities.

As conclusive discussion, Dr. Halliday's chapters on the elements of belief, particularly the one on "The God of the Younger Generation," would leave much to be desired. His aim, however, is not to be conclusive but to establish a point of view from which any inquiring mind, young or old, can look constructively and without undue dismay at the radical factors in our present-day religious turmoil. That some people will still be severely shocked by his views goes without saying. The miracles, the Virgin Birth, an abridged Bible, the deity of Jesus, the physical resurrection of Christ—all these things cannot be frankly discussed, even yet, without a collision with cherished attitudes. Nor can a man calmly place much of the blame for the religious discouragement of youth on the ministry and the Christian home without arousing intense antagonism from those who are satisfied with static institutions. But Dr. Halliday is aiming straight at the heads and hearts of those who are looking for the constant something-better of real progress, those who are looking for a clearer, truer faith.

Such robbery, then, as Dr. Holliday experienced, plus his contact with a character like that of Robert Robinson, should be a common experience. From such redeemed robbery of youth will come a new intensity and a new freedom. "The younger generation believes in God, believes with all its heart and soul and mind," but not in the God of the old religionists. "The younger generation believes in Jesus, believes in him as never before it could believe," but not in the Jesus of medieval doctrine. The younger generation believes in man," but in man with a god-like power of infinite growth toward a goal inherent in its own idealism. The younger generation believes, in salvation *of character,* and in the *spiritual* authority of the Bible. And the younger generation believes in its own God-given potentialities.

> It finds in the profoundest depths of human nature what it is pleased to regard as the spirit of the Eternal. It is conscious of a godwardness which is irresistible. . . . that every soul is a bundle of undeveloped powers and resources and that the building of a greater soul is the big business of life.

The book is of particular value, not because it clears the theological field, for other books have done that capably; nor because of its intensely sympathetic attitude toward the essential promise of youth, for this also is common today. But Mr. Halliday has put the two values together in a remarkably clean-cut way, giving his own experience freely and frankly that he might think *with* his readers through the problems he outlines. It is truly a dramatic story.

SARAH JOSSELYN WILSON.

*Robbing Youth of Its Religion, by James F. Halliday. Henry Holt & Company.

One of the Ten Thousand "Lives" of Christ

Dr. Bowie's biography of Jesus* is principally noteworthy because it is another. Which of itself is less than no distinction! No rain-drop materially differs from another, but all the drops together make a shower. The flood of new biographies which each generation pours forth—and this generation probably more than any of its predecessors—would be enraging if it were not, indeed, a flood. To become enraged would be like getting mad at a storm. Rather it would be more philosophical to demand that every Christian minister should write a biography of Jesus. While we are about it, suppose we require that each shall write three, one at the beginning of his ministry, one at mid-career, and one as he totters toward the end. Each of the three would differ from the others about as much as all three would differ from those of a different author. The exercise would reveal more clearly the nature of the Christian tradition than it is now understood, and might have the additional value of showing the churches what they might expect from ministerial candidates.

Dr. Bowie's biography is the product of his mid-career. He is a highly honored minister of his type, and this book sharply limns the type. He latterly enjoys the distinction of being a cleric who declined a bishopric, though in this he now has considerable company. He is mystic enough to retain the miracles of the Christian tradition without allowing a scientific age to put him to scorn. He does not deny the miracles; that would embarrass him severely as the rector of one of the foremost parishes in the Protestant Episcopal communion. He simply brushes aside all the difficulties into which scientists might seek to drive him by declaring that the physical facts do not count either way; only the spiritual "meaning" which he is pleased to extract from the scriptural narrations have significance.

This ought to make the book exceedingly comforting to fearful saints and helpful to baffled homiletes. Dr. Bowie's "intuitions" are highly developed. In both a noble and also a questionable sense the book is feminine. Not without incidental significance is the tribute in the closing paragraph of his preface to the four women who as his secretaries have made this and his previous books possible. His mysticism is not bizarre or grotesque; but it is convenient. Such portions of the gospel stories as offend modern intelligence or prejudice, as the case may be, he sweetly redeems by his skill in extracting "spiritual" significances.

This facility enables Dr. Bowie to remain blithely disregardful of the outstanding religious problems of present-day thinking and programming. He serenely fans out the more grotesque medievalism of much accepted Christian tradition, but he remains altogether oblivious to such central questions as the existence of deity, Jesus' Father-God or any other. He toils not nor spins with those who seek a morality wrought out of factual and tactual experience, but exultantly sets forth an ethic born and nurtured in a mystical aloofness.

The book ought to have been written, and many ought to read it not to find anything new in it, for all of it has been spoken and written times without number, but as one additional demonstration that Jesus is that character, sublime, or vapid, or grotesque, whom history has so slightly documented as to permit employment as the focus and exponent of ideas and ideals which any and all may be moved to entertain as worthy. Few exercises can be so revealing of the biographer's religious ideals and ethical fibre as this of composing a biography of Jesus. The story can be told in any terms and to any intent which may please the writer. Like most of these biographers Dr. Bowie has simply revealed himself. He is here the gentle and sweet-spirited character which his many devoted parishioners have found him. The book has no other outstanding significance.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

*"The Master," a Life of Jesus Christ, by Walter Russell Bowie. Published by Charles Scribners Sons.

Correspondence

Religion and Nationalism in India

Editor of UNITY: Mr. C. F. Andrews' address in UNITY entitled "Gandhi's Program for India," is remarkable for its clear vision and sympathy. Mr. Andrews is an old friend of India and is respected and loved by all classes of the Indian people for his indefatigable labors in the cause of Indian nationalism and for his services in the field of social reform and educational advance. There is one point in his address on which I may be allowed to say a few words.

Mr. Gandhi's attempt to do away with religious differences and to bring about Hindu-Moslem unity is a dream, and not even a sensible dream. The difference between the Hindu and the Moslem is deeply rooted in religion, in ritual, in history, in traditions, and in outlook on life, and will not cease to exist. It is not the creation of yesterday and will not pass away tomorrow. A cow slaughtered in the Hindu quarter, and a dead pig thrown into the mosque, is enough to fan the flames and to incite the two communities to fall at each other's throats. The cow is sacred to the Hindu and its protection is enjoined upon him by his sacred books. The Hindu will not eat beef nor tolerate beef eating because the cow to him is always sacred and divine; the Moslem will not eat bacon because to him it is always unclean and impure, and strictly prohibited by the injunctions of the Koran. The Hindus cannot assimilate and fuse with the cow slayers and cannot admit them into their personal and social relations. Fire and water may meet, but beef and bacon will never mix and unite to form a compact nation. It is utterly unthinkable and impossible.

Those Indian politicians who accept Gandhi's political creed and hope to achieve Hindu-Moslem unity by mystical appeals are liable to ruin the future greatness of their country and to throw back her progress by a century. They are swayed more by sentimental emotion than by actual facts. They refuse to look facts in the face and to take a realistic view of Indian politics. They know perfectly well that religion frustrates every attempt at unity and reform, and condemns their unhappy country to bear the yoke of foreign subjection. It is the most obnoxious weed in Indian politics and nothing but its complete excision will free India from imperialistic domination and exploitation.

British rule in India does not rest on force or the consent of the governed, but on religion. Were it to disappear miraculously from India today the whole despotic governmental machinery set up by the foreigner would collapse tomorrow. No machine guns, no efficient instruments of human destruction, no resources of materialistic science, no political acumen, and no subtle diplomacy can ever hope to keep three hundred million in bondage if they resolve to throw away imperialistic despotism. But Indians are divided into too many castes, creeds, and impermeable stratifications to present a united front to the common enemy and to compel him to listen to national demands. As long as there is religion in India, British

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

AN INVITATION TO NEW YORK SUBSCRIBERS

"The Truth Seekers," a group of young men and young women interested in an interchange of ideas where good fellowship prevails, extend a cordial invitation to kindred spirits to attend their get-to-gethers held every Sunday evening at 8 P. M. in the studio of Goldstein's Florist Shoppe, 553 Sutter Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

AN APPEAL FOR HAITI

Hon. Henry L. Stimson,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

Sir: This organization, concerned with the civil liberties set forth in our fundamental law, has long opposed the denial of those liberties to the people of Haiti under what is in effect rule by our Navy Department. Whatever legal fiction may be advanced to the contrary, actually the Haitian Government is under the control of the United States through our resident Commissioner.

We are addressing you in the light of events of the last few days in Haiti in which a so-called strike and political uprising against the Haitian Government and American Occupation has been put down by force. We are familiar with the causes leading up to this expression of opposition to intolerable conditions by a people whose civil and political rights have long been denied them by the American Occupation.

We enter our protest against the further denial of those rights which will result in the future as it has now in other similar manifestations. On behalf of a large section of the American people who have long resented our policy in Haiti, dictated as it has been by American financial interests, we urge:

1st: The immediate removal of the censorship of the press; the freeing of editors imprisoned; and the dropping of prosecutions against newspapers and their editors. We particularly urge redress for the act of the American marines on the night of October 28th who broke into the office of *Petit Capois*, dismantled the press and carried off the type because of that paper's opposition to the policies of the Occupation;

2nd: Freedom of political organization. We are reliably informed that all efforts to independent political action are frustrated by breaking up meetings, organized spying upon all those who associate themselves with such a movement and by interference with the printing and distribution of literature;

3rd: The calling of new elections in Haiti to replace a government which even under the present treaty, forced upon Haiti by the United States, is without legal authority. The elections fixed for 1930 as provided in the constitution have been unlawfully confined to local officials. Haiti is entitled to choose its own parliament. That right has been denied them, presumably by action of the American commissioner.

We believe that the proposal to send a commission to investigate the situation is unnecessary. The facts are known. Our American responsibilities are clear. The remedies were clearly stated as long ago as 1922 by a group of 24 distinguished American lawyers who said in a pamphlet issued by the Foreign Policy Association:

"We declare, without qualification, that the honor and good name of the United States, the preservation of the sovereignty and the cherished liberty of Haiti and her right to fair dealings on part of the United States, as well as the possibility of assuring the continuance in the future of honorable and amicable relations between our country and Latin-America, based on trust and confidence, all require:

(a) The immediate abrogation by United States of the treaty of 1915, unconditionally and without qualifications.

(b) The holding of elections of representatives to the legislative bodies of Haiti and of a President by the free will of the people at an early date.

(c) The negotiation for friendly cooperation between the United States and Haiti upon such terms as shall be mutually satisfactory to both countries and by the methods that obtain between free and independent sovereign states."

Among the signers of that report were: Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., of the Harvard Law School; Felix Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School; the late Moorfield Storey, former president of the Bar Association; the late Louis Marshall of New York; Michael Francis Doyle of Philadelphia; Alfred Bettman of Cincinnati, former Assistant Attorney General; Francis Fisher Kane, former U. S. District Attorney, and George W. Kirchwey of New York, former Dean of Columbia Law School.

We urge upon the Department of State immediate action to restore to the Haitian people their civil and political rights in order to avoid the recurrence of such tragic manifestations of justified resentment as have just taken place. It should be axiomatic that wherever control by the United States extends, it should be accompanied by the civil and political liberties which we profess.

We are, Sir

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Harry F. Ward,
Joseph Schlossberg,
B. W. Huebsch,
William L. Nunn,
Forrest Bailey,
Roger N. Baldwin,
John Haynes Holmes.

TWO GREAT PHYSICIANS ON THE LIQUOR QUESTION

Dr. Mayo on Prohibition

Repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act, and the substitution therefor of a temperance policy that will permit consumption in the United States of light wines and beers finds no champion in Dr. Mayo.

"Only the froth of society is really opposed to prohibition in America," he said. "The great bulk of our population is quite satisfied with it and, from the point of view of public health, there never has been any question but that abstinence from liquor would prove extremely beneficial," he said.

"Water," said the doctor, "is a much overlooked factor in the cause of prohibition. By that I mean good water." He pointed to Vienna to prove his case. There, he said, with the creation of an adequate supply of good drinking water, consumption of alcohol has fallen off 40 per cent in ten years.

Water Aids Health

"And good water has played a tremendously important part in the betterment of the public health in the United States, which has showed marked improvement each year," he declared.

Dr. Osler and Alcohol

No account of Osler's public health activities would be complete without a reference to his views on the alcohol problem. In this connection the following two passages are worth quoting. The first is from his essay on "Medicine in the Nineteenth Century,"

---

rule is secure and no movement can question its supremacy and dislodge it from its authority.

It is needless to say that India lacks the right type of leadership and is guided by men who think more of their religion and future salvation than of her interests. She needs men of the stamp of Lenin, Herzen, Kemal, and Sun who sacrifice everything for the cause they have most at heart and brush aside religious superstitions and lies of mankind if they happen to come in conflict with national ideals and greatness. Jawahar Lall Nehru is the first son of India who has transcended communal distinctions and has rejected what is demoralizing and degrading in Indian politics. He is the idol of young India and commands a sincere love and support of the younger generation. He is the man to lead India to her cherished goal.

DALJIT SINGH SADHARIA.

Gandhi's Autobiography

Editor of UNITY: I read with interest all of Gandhi's autobiography as it appeared from time to time in UNITY. Especially was I pleased with his statement, in the closing chapter, that those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means.

I think of theology as the science that treats of the relationship of individuals, one with another and with God; of politics as the science of the formulation and administration of rules regulating the acts of individuals toward one another; and of religion of one's reactions to all with which he comes in contact. It is Gandhi's ethical reaction to unethical politics that I admire. It is for the same reason, that I admire UNITY.

W. B. CALKINS.

Montebello, Calif.

A Timely New Book

PALESTINE

TODAY AND TOMORROW

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Dr. Stephen S. Wise says: "It is the most understanding book that has been written about Palestine." It is also a most revealing book, based on a recent journey through Palestine and written largely since the recent riots between Jews and Arabs. The Zionist movement in all its aspects is graphically surveyed. You will finish this unusual exposition with a new understanding of Palestine and its problems.

Just Published by THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Price $2.50

Order from UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

JANUARY

Preparations for a trip south, or a continuation of Winter Social Activities at home, suggest that you save expense thru the cleansing of your garments by our new system of continuous clarification.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

written in 1901: "A man may take four or five drinks of whisky a day or even more and think that he transacts business better with that amount of stimulus, but it only too frequently happens that early in the fifth decade, just as business or political success is assured, Bacchus hands in heavy bills for payment in the form of serious disease of the arteries or of the liver, and there is a general breakdown." In an address at the Working Men's College, Camden Town, in 1906, he is even more forcible. "Throw all the beer and spirits into the Irish Channel, the English Channel and the North Sea for a year, and the people in England would be infinitely better. It would certainly solve all the problems with which the philanthropists, the physicians and the politicians have to deal."—Rolleston, J. D.: Osler as Epidemiologist, Clin. J., Nov. 28, 1928.

AN INDISPENSABLE BOOK ON INDIA

Strongly endorsed by Tagore, Gandhi, Lajpat Rai, Mrs. Besant, Presidents of the Indian National Congress, Indian Leaders of All Parties, practically the Whole Periodical Press of India.

INDIA IN BONDAGE

Her Right to Freedom and a Place Among the Great Nations
By JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.

Pp. 556. 12 Illustrations. Price at Booksellers $4.00, by mail $4.10.
Lewis Copeland Co., Inc.
Publishers, 119 West 57th St.
New York, N. Y.

This book, just from the press in New York, was published a few months ago in India. The British Government, alarmed at its quick and great sale, suppressed it, and arrested its publishers. Practically all India answered by indignant protests. Mahatma Gandhi published an article in the book's defense, four columns in length.

No other word in our generation has been so universally acclaimed by the highest Indian authorities, as a true and just portrayal of India's civilization, life, and political conditions.

RABINDRANATH TAGORE the poet writes: "If Americans would know the true India, they cannot have a better guide than Dr. Sunderland. I regard his book as the best informed, most just and trustworthy that has come from any pen. A part of its high value is as an unanswerable reply to the misrepresentations in Miss Mayo's **Mother India.**"

MRS. ANNA BESANT writes: "Dr. Sunderland's powerful chapters should be read by everybody who would understand India."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES says: "No other American is so widely known or so loved in India, as Dr. Sunderland, and this book gives eloquent testimony as to the reasons why."

THE PATRIKA, Calcutta's leading daily declares: **"India in Bondage easily takes the first place among all the books on India in recent years."**